## **EXHIBIT B**

## ORIGINAL

	SOUTHERN DISTR	BANKRUPTCY COURT ICT OF NEW YORK
In Re:		
111 1/6.		05-44481 (RDD)
DELPHI CORPOR	ATION, et al.,	One Bowling Green
Deht.	^re	New York, New York
	ors.	April 30, 2008
TRAN	SCRIPT OF MOTIONS ONORABLE ROBERT D.	MAN TO
UNITED S'	TATES BANKRUPTCY	. DRAIN JUDGE
APPEARANCES:		
For the Debtors:	JOHN WM. BUT	TLER, JR., ESQ.
	KAYALYN A. MARAFIOTI, ESQ. THOMAS J. MATZ, ESQ.	
	Skadden, Arp	os, Slate, Meagher
	& Flom, LLP	•
	Four Times S	Square ww York 10036
Mana County of the con-		
For Creditors Com.:	ROBERT J. ROSENBERG, ESQ. MICHAEL RIELA, ESQ.	
	Latham & Wat	kins
	885 Third Av	
		w York 10022
For Equity Com.:		GART, ESQ.
	Fried, Frank & Jacobson,	, Harris, Shriver
	One New York	Plaza
		w York 10004
For ADAH:	THOMAS E. LA	URIA, ESQ.
	White & Case	, LLP
	Miami, Flori	scayne Boulevard da 33131
		continued on next page)
REGENC	Y REPORTING, INC.	•
Certified Court	Reporters & Video	ographers
Roseland, NJ 0706	enue 575 Mad	ison Avenue k, NY 10022
www.regencyrepor		-268-7866

revised blacklined order and I'll grant the motion. It appears to me the debtors have been acting in good faith. They obviously still have remaining issues in respect of the plan and/or a modification thereof and, consequently, this extension which, again, is consensual on this basis is warranted. So I'll enter that order.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, you also touched briefly on the 4(m) motion. That's actually the next one, Item 5. This is the post-confirmation extension of avoidance action service deadlines motion at docket No. 13361 and, Your Honor, this deals with the debtor's seeking an entry of an order extending the deadline to serve process pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 7004(a) and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 4(m) that's made applicable by Bankruptcy Rule 7004(a) for avoidance actions filed in connection with the preservation of estate claims procedures order earlier entered by this Court at docket No. 12471.

We did give some specific notice in connection with this, Your Honor. We gave notice of the motion to Lenico Engineering Company, Wachovia Bank National Association and the master service list and the 2002 list. The reason that we gave specific notice to Lenico and Wachovia was because those were the only two parties that had been identified under Exhibit 7.24 of the plan as having the avoidance actions preserved under the plan and, therefore, we gave particularized notice to them of the relief

· 1

sought by the debtors. We have not given notice to the 742 other defendants therein which are under seal and it was not served on those defendants except to the extent those defendants already had placed themselves on either the master service list or the 2002 list.

There were no objections to the motion. At the moment, Your Honor, prior to Your Honor's order, we believe that it's appropriate to get a further extension. Right now, the extension is through May 31, 2008, that's Your Honor's -- a prior order entered on March 28th at docket No. 13277 and, again, the process that we're looking for here is essentially the same formulation we did in the 365(d)(4) motion and I presume with a similar modification from Your Honor, the idea here is to not have to deal with these complaints so long as we have the plan process that we're moving forward with.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, first, I continue to believe that there is good cause for the relief sought here. Except for the notice you did give I don't think any further notice is necessary under the plain terms of 9006 and the cause is obviously that the analysis so far that's represented in the motion is the same as it was when the motion was originally granted which is that these causes of action are being preserved in light of the limitations period, however, it's not presently contemplated that they will be pursued, although obviously the preservation of them means that they may be pursued but given that there's no reason for